

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

It is respectfully noted that claim 49 presented with the last amendment, which deals with the application as shown in FIG. 7 of a mounting strip 31 to the back or outer face of the antenna strip 1, has not been examined on the merits. An offhanded objection for lack of support was admittedly made in paragraph 25 of the office action, but this is clearly incorrect since original claim 49, which has been reinstated as claim 53, clearly reads on the elected species of FIG. 7 where a mounting strip of "support layer" 31 is adhered to the back of the antenna strip 1.

Since there was not a complete action on the merits on all the claims until the office action of 29 July 2010, this action could not be final.

An action on the merits on claim 53 is therefore respectfully requested.

The main claim of this case is basically rejected on two references that are both structurally different from the instant invention.

More particularly, Paragraph 0020 -- 0023 of German 102 05 914 of Grassl state:

FIG. 1 shows a polyester foil 1 as an intermediate product with an antenna coil formed thereon with the etch/wash procedure of German 197 39 193. The antenna coil 2 has at each of its ends a contact 3 for connecting with further electronic elements, in particular for connecting to a chip according to the flip-chip technique. The polyester foil 1 according to FIG. 1 has for example the length and width dimensions of a standard ISO chip card. It is preferably before or after mounting of the antenna coil cut or stamped from a large sheet that is carried on a roll.

FIG. 2 shows a section through the polyester foil of FIG. 1 at the coil contacts 3. The polyester foil is comprised of a polyester support foil 1a that on one side is provided with a laminatable layer 1b. The laminatable layer 1b is either an adhesive that is applied to the polyester support foil 1 before the antenna coil is made or of a layer of amorphous polyester (PETG) that is coextruded with the polyester foil 1a. The adhesive can be for example a polyester copolymer or polyurethane system.

FIG. 3 shows the polyester foil of FIG. 2 as a more manufactured product in that a thin chip with contacts 5 is mounted as flip chip on the contacts 3 of the coil 2. A stabilizing foil 6 is laminated on top the chip arrangement directly to the chip. Alternatively instead of the stabilizing foil there can be a stabilizing lacquer coating. The stabilizing foil or lacquer coating serves to protect the chip, which is less than 25 μm thick, from mechanical stress and other external influences.

Thus Grassl does not show in any respect a chip module secured to the inner face of a film strip or to anything else.

Even in the finished assembly, the chip module engages but is not in any way secured to the "stabilizing foil 6." Instead in Grassl the adhesive 1b is on the antenna foil and adheres to the stabilizing foil, unless there is no stabilizing foil and just a lacquer layer.

In fact the fact that Grassl teaches that a foil is the equivalent of some paint clearly shows that this is a different system, and in no way suggests "securing a plurality of the chip modules to the inner face of an elongated module film strip." It would be impossible to secure a plurality of the chips 4 to the stabilizing PE foil 6 or to a layer of paint.

Finally the presumption that the foil/layer 6 extends all around past the coil is just that, a presumption. FIGS. 2 and 3 are sections (see line II--II in FIG. 1) and only indicate that the foil/lacquer 6 bridges a part of the antenna 2 at the contacts. Whether it extends as describes in claim 1 "generally all around each of the chip modules" is pure conjecture.

This is why no rejection was made on Grassl all alone; this reference lacks several clearly claimed features of the instant invention.

US patent 6,886,246 of Chung is purely cumulative to Grassl, and in fact shows less. Here there is nothing holding an antenna and a chip module against each other. Instead there are electronic devices 212 sitting on contacts 228 and covered by a

liquid potting, or, as stated in the Abstract, "a layer of melt-flowable adhesive of substantially uniform thickness on the first broad planar surface of the substrate to cover the electronic device. The article produced thereby has the electronic device encapsulated by the layer of melt-flowable adhesive." Thus once again there is nothing to suggest a row of chip modules adhered to a film strip and then pressed against a row of antennas to make contact between them, then pressing the film strip down against the antenna strip to bond it all around the chip module. In Chung, recourse is had to a flowed on substance that in no way can be called a "film strip" to which the chip modules are secured.

Thus the combination of Grassl and Chung does not teach adhering the modules in a row to a film strip and then pressing them against a plurality of antennas, with the film strip then bonded all around the chip modules to the antennas. Instead both references teach individual chips that are secured to antennas and that are then potted in place. The §103 rejection on the combined references must fall.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

KF Ross PC

/Andrew Wilford/

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

28 October 2010
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure:

None.